MONTGOMERY SCARP, PLLC 1218 Third Avenue, Suite 2500 Seattle, Washington 98101 Telephone (206) 625-1801 THE HONORABLE THOMAS RICE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

LAWRENCE DARREN MOLDER,
Plaintiff,

v.

BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY,
Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-00257-TOR

DEFENDANT BNSF'S [PROPOSED] FRSA VERDICT FORM

FRSA VERDICT FORM

QUESTION 1: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he engaged in protected activity by reporting an on-the-job injury, in good faith, to a BNSF manager in 2009?

ANSWEI	R: (Yes or N	lo)					
IC	• "77	,,	, •	. 0	, •	2 10	

If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 2. If your answer is "No," skip Questions 2, 3, and 4, and continue to Question 5.

QUESTION 2: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the decision-makers in his dismissal, David Thornton and Brian Clunn, knew at the time they made their dismissal decisions that Plaintiff had report an on the job injury in 2009 when Plaintiff was dismissed?

ANSWER: (Yes or No)	

If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 3. If your answer is "No," skip Questions 3 and 4, and continue to Question 5.

QUESTION 3: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the
evidence that Plaintiff's reporting a work-related injury in 2009 was a contributing
factor in the dismissal decision?
ANSWER: (Yes or No)
If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 4. If your answer is "No," skip Question 4, and continue to Question 5.
QUESTION 4: Has BNSF proven by clear and convincing evidence that it would
have dismissed the Plaintiff even if he had never reported an on-the-job injury in
2009?
ANSWER: (Yes or No)
Continue to Question No. 5.
OUESTION 5. Did Digitiff Doman Moldon, mayo by a man and anong of the

QUESTION 5: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he engaged in protected activity by reporting an on-the-job injury, in good faith, to a BNSF manager in 2017?

ANSWER: (Yes or No)_____

If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 6. If your answer is "No," continue to Question 9 ONLY IF you answered "No" to Question 4. If you did not answer Question 4 (because your answer was "No" to Questions 1, 2, or 3), or if your

answer to Question 4 was "Yes," then sign this verdict form and return it to the Bailiff.

QUESTION 6: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the decision-makers in his dismissal, David Thornton and Brian Clunn, knew at the time they made their dismissal decisions that Plaintiff had reported an on-the-job injury in February 2017?

	ANSWER:	(Yes or No)
--	---------	-------------

If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 7. If your answer is "No," continue to Question 9 ONLY IF you answered "No" to Question 4. If you did not answer Question 4 (because your answer was "No" to Questions 1, 2, or 3), or if your answer to Question 4 was "Yes," then sign this verdict form and return it to the Bailiff.

QUESTION 7: Did Plaintiff, Darren Molder, prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Plaintiff's report in February 2017 of an on-the-job injury was a contributing factor in the dismissal decision?

If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 8. If your answer is "No," continue to Question 9 ONLY IF you answered "No" to Question 4. If you did not answer Question 4 (because your answer was "No" to Questions 1, 2, or 3), or if your answer to Question 4 was "Yes," then sign this verdict form and return it to the Bailiff.

QUESTION 8: Has BNSF proven by clear and convincing evidence that it would
have dismissed the Plaintiff even if he had never reported an on the job injury in
2017?
ANSWER: (Yes or No)
If your answer is "No," continue to Question 9. If your answer is "Yes," continue to Question 9 ONLY IF you answered "No" to Question 4. If you answered "No" to Question 8 and did not answer Question 4 (because your answer was "No" to Questions 1, 2, or 3) or if your answer to Question 4 was "Yes," then sign this verdict form and return it to the Bailiff.
QUESTION 9: What amount of damages do you find from the preponderance of
the evidence would adequately compensate the Plaintiff for emotional distress, if
any, from the actions you found in response to Questions 3 and/or 7? Your answer
may not exceed \$150,000. You may not award damages for any other reason.
ANSWER:
The foregoing is the unanimous verdict of the jury.
Dated this, 2019.
PRESIDING JUROR